REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-29 and 35-50 are pending. Claims 30-34 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 9, 14, 20, and 35 have been amended. In view of the amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the application be forwarded along to issuance.

§101 Rejections

The Examiner is maintaining the rejection of Claims 1-8, 20-34, 41-42, and 47-48 under 35 USC § 101. The Examiner asserts that these claims are directed to mere abstract ideas.

Claims 1-8, 41, and 42: Claim 1 is directed to a method or process while each of Claims 2-8, 41, and 42 depend ultimately from Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "defining a computer-readable resource designator using a computing device, the computer-readable resource designator being associated with the human-readable resource designator and that can be used by a computer to automatically access the readable resource." Claim 1 now, as suggested by the Examiner, recites an act that is required to be implemented through use of a computing device. Claims 2-8, 41, and 42 each inherit this limitation.

Claims 20-29, 47, and 48: Claim 20 is directed to a system and Claims 21-29, 47 and 48 depend ultimately from claim 20. Claim 20 has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to recite a computing device. Claims 21-29, 48, and 28 each inherit this limitation.

Claims 30-34: Claims 30-34 have been cancelled.

§103 Rejections

The Examiner is maintaining the rejections of Claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,076,733 to Wilz, et al. (hereinafter "Wilz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,542,933 to Durst (hereinafter "Durst").

Claim 1 recites a method comprising:

- providing a readable resource;
- defining a human-readable resource designator associated with the readable resource;
- defining a computer-readable resource designator using a computing device, the computer-readable resource designator being associated with the human-readable resource designator and that can be used by a computer to automatically access the readable resource; and
- forming, on the readable resource, the human-readable resource designator and the computer-readable resource designator, the computer-readable resource designator comprising means for the computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to access the particular readable resource on which the computer readable resource designator is formed preventing said computer from confusing said computer-readable resource designator with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource.

Neither Durst nor Wilz (individually or combined) teaches or suggests defining a computer-readable resource designator using a computing device where that computer-readable resource designator comprises means for a computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to access the readable resource on which the computer readable resource designator is formed, thus, preventing the computer from confusing the computer-readable resource designator with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource.

The Examiner admits that Wilz fails to teach that the computer readable resource designator that comprises a means for the computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to access the readable resource. Instead, the Examiner relies on Durst.

Durst teaches using a barcode to encode encrypted symbol data and an unencrypted or "clear" checksum. Durst, col. 4, line 59 through col. 5, line 12. The barcode is printed on a document such as a brochure, magazine insert or page, an envelope, or a memo. Durst, col. 4, lines 51-58; col. 6, line 55 through col. 7, line 3. The symbol data includes an URL for accessing electronic data from a database. Durst, col. 4, lines 51-58. The barcode is scanned to identify the clear checksum and the encrypted symbol data. The clear checksum is used to decrypt the symbol data which is then used to calculate a checksum. Durst, col. 7, lines 4-23. The clear checksum and the calculated checksum are compared. Durst, col. 7, lines 23-27. If they match the URL from the symbol data is used to access the electronic data. Durst, col. 7, lines 37-34.

The Examiner makes the following statement:

> Durst teaches after scanning a bar code symbol of an intelligent document, the bar code system is tested to verify its validation by using checksum method. If the bar code symbol is a valid bar code symbol, a go/no go signal indicates that the data transmission process is successful and then the system will uses the URL that is included in the bar code system to retrieve a file as a readable resource. The above information shows that the bar code symbol is confirmed to be a valid bar code symbol for retrieving or accessing the file (figs. 4&5, col. 7, lines 4-12; col. 8, lines 15-25; col. 2, lines 40-45).

Even assuming these statements to be true, the Examiner has not set out a prima facia case for obviousness. Durst' s checksum/barcode is only used to verify that the bar code encodes an URL that has been associated with the checksum. There is no verification that the URL can be used to access the particular document on which the barcode is formed. Durst' s barcode/checksum combination does NOT enable a computer scanning the barcode to discern that the URL encoded by the barcode is for accessing the same document on which the barcode has been formed as opposed to a different document or different data.

Therefore Durst's barcode/checksum combination is NOT equivalent to a means for a computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to access the readable resource on which the computer readable resource designator is formed, thus, preventing the computer from confusing the

computer-readable resource designator with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource.

For at least these reasons, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established, and Claim 1 distinguishes over Wilz in view of Durst.

Claims 2-8, 41, and 42 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 9 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to implement the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 9.

Claims 10-13, 43, and 44 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 9 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 9, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 14 has been amended and, as amended recites a method comprising:

- reading, with a computer, a computer-readable resource designator displayed on a readable resource and displayed in conjunction with a human-readable resource designator that can be read by a human and used to access the readable resource;
- confirming that the computer readable resource designator can be used to automatically access the particular readable resource on which the computer readable resource is displayed preventing said computer from confusing said computer-readable resource designator with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource;
- processing the computer-readable resource designator to identify a network-accessible resource;

- requesting the readable resource from the network-accessible resource; and
- receiving the readable resource.

In short, Claim 14 requires reading a computer readable designator displayed on a readable resource, confirming that the designator can be used to access the particular readable resource on which it appears, requesting and receiving the readable resource. Wilz and Durst neither disclose nor suggest a method in which a computer-readable resource designator displayed on a readable resource is read and then confirming that the computer readable resource designator can be used to automatically access that same particular readable resource on which the computer readable resource designator is displayed.

As with Claim 1, The Examiner admits that Wilz does not teach the act of confirming listed above. Instead, the Examiner relies on Durst. Durst teaches using a barcode to encode encrypted symbol data and an unencrypted or "clear" checksum. Durst, col. 4, line 59 through col. 5, line 12. The barcode is printed on a document such as a brochure, magazine insert or page, an envelope, or a memo. Durst, col. 4, lines 51-58; col. 6, line 55 through col. 7, line 3. The symbol data includes an URL for accessing electronic data from a database. Durst, col. 4, lines 51-58. The barcode is scanned to identify the clear checksum and the encrypted symbol data. The clear checksum is used to decrypt the symbol data which is then used to calculate a checksum. Durst, col. 7, lines 4-23. The clear checksum and the calculated checksum are compared. Durst, col. 7, lines 23-27. If they match the URL from the symbol data is used to access the electronic data. Durst, col. 7, lines 37-34.

Again, the Examiner makes the following statement:

> Durst teaches after scanning a bar code symbol of an intelligent document, the bar code system is tested to verify its validation by using checksum method. If the bar code symbol is a valid bar code symbol, a go/no go signal indicates that the data transmission process is successful and then the system will uses the URL that is included in the bar code system to retrieve a file as a readable resource. The above information shows that the bar code symbol is confirmed to be a valid bar code symbol for retrieving or accessing the file (figs. 4&5, col. 7, lines 4-12; col. 8, lines 15-25; col. 2, lines 40-45).

Durst' s checksum/barcode is only used to verify that the bar code encodes an URL that has been associated with the checksum. There is no verification that the URL can be used to access the particular document on which the barcode is formed. Durst' s barcode/checksum combination does NOT enable a computer scanning the barcode to discern that the URL encoded by the barcode is for accessing the same document on which the barcode has been formed as opposed to a different document or different data.

Therefore the use of Durst' s barcode/checksum combination is NOT equivalent to " confirming that the computer readable resource designator can be used to automatically access the particular readable resource on which the computer readable resource is displayed preventing said computer from confusing said computer-readable resource designator with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource" as recited by Claim 14.

For at least these reasons, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established, and Claim 14 is patentable over Wilz in view of Durst.

Claims 15-19, 45, and 46 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 14 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 14, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 20 recites a system, comprising:

- a readable resource; and
- a computing device operable to cause a human-readable resource designator to be formed on the readable resource, said human readable resource designator being associated with the readable resource; and to cause a computer-readable resource designator to be formed on the readable resource, said computer-readable resource designator being useable to access the readable resource;
- the computer-readable resource designator being associated with and corresponding to the human-readable resource designator;

- the computer-readable resource designator being configured for use by a computer so that a computer can automatically retrieve the readable resource and the computer readable resource designator comprising means for the computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to retrieve the particular readable resource on which the computer readable resource is formed preventing said computer from confusing said computer-readable resource designator with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource that can be used by the computer to access other resources not associated with both the human-readable resource designator and the computer-readable resource designator.

In short, Claim 20 requires a computing device capable of forming a computer readable resource designator on a readable resource where the computer readable resource designator includes means for confirming that the computer readable resource designator can be used to retrieve the particular readable resource on which is formed. As made clear above, Wilz both alone and in combination with Durst fails to teach or suggest a computer readable resource designator on a web page or any other readable resource where that designator comprises " means for the computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to retrieve the particular readable resource on which the computer readable resource is formed preventing said computer from confusing said computer-readable resource designator with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource that can be used by the computer to access other resources not associated with both the human-readable resource designator and the computer-readable resource designator" as recited by Claim 20.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established, and Claim 20 is patentable over distinguishes over Wilz in view of Durst.

Claims 21-29, 47, and 48 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 20 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 20, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claims 30-34 have been cancelled.

Claim 35 recites a system, comprising:

- a readable resource on which a human-readable resource designator and a computer-readable resource designator associated with and corresponding to the human-readable resource designator have been formed;
- the computer-readable resource designator being configured for use by a computer so that a computer can automatically retrieve the readable resource, the computer readable resource designator comprising means for the computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to retrieve the particular readable resource on which the computer readable resource designator has been formed preventing said computer from confusing said computer-readable resource designator with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource;
- a server configured to receive requests from the computer for an electronic version of the readable resource associated with both the human-readable resource designator and the computer-readable resource designator, and return the readable resource to the computer; and
- a data store for holding the electronic version of the readable resource that can be requested by the computer

Claim 35 requires a readable resource on which a computer readable resource has been formed where the computer readable resource designator includes means for confirming that the computer readable resource designator can be used to retrieve the particular readable resource on which is formed. As made clear above, Wilz both alone and in combination with Durst fails to teach or suggest a computer readable resource designator on a web page or any other readable resource where that designator comprises " means for the computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to retrieve the particular readable resource on which the computer readable resource designator has been formed preventing said computer from confusing said computer-readable resource designator with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource" as recited by Claim 35.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established, and Claim 35 is patentable over Wilz in view of Durst.

Claims 36-40, 49 and 50 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 35 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 35, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-50 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Guy L. Burnham

By _____
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

September 22, 2005